

5-25-2017 Conf. Call

in process (maybe next week)

When?

next wk for E-W?

Evaluation of Feasibility and Initial Design of an Interim Cap for the Aerovox Nearshore Area - Status Update 18MAY2017		
Task	Status Update	Action Item(s)
1 Physical characterization of the nearshore area including the full width of the waterway	developing 13 E-W transects on a 50' spacing based on the 2015 bathymetric survey. Dave D. suggested N-S transects as well at 50 ft spacing. <i>E-W are done N-S underway to</i>	- Initial E-W transects should be available next week - for this and additional Jacobs tasks below, a field change notification is being drafted
2 3D extent of DNAPL beneath the nearshore area	3-D figure has not yet been started - once drafted, it will be refined with data collected in the field effort <i>NO! See Jan 17 report</i>	- develop field sampling plan, has started by JEE
3 Groundwater discharge zones and discharge rates in the nearshore area	Mike M. has contacted Marilyn Wade at Brown & Caldwell on using existing model Dave D. contacted MADEP with update	Awaiting scheduling of call with Brown & Caldwell
4 Flux of dissolved phase contaminants	Discussion with Jacobs, Battelle and NAE arrived at: 1) Current plan is to assess flux rate from sediment to water column (or vice-versa). This will tell us what we should expect for a flux into the cap (and factor into design); 2) This plan will not allow for quantification of flux from groundwater (from Aerovox) into sediment. That may be moot right now. To fully characterize a groundwater flux (beyond simple analytical or numerical model assessment) would require a Geoprobe type investigation to install deeper measuring points, i.e., ~ 15 ft below sediment surface; 3) PEDs for flux would be a good way to monitor cap performance. PEDs have lower detection limits (more sensitive) than any other available approach, AND they are less "intrusive" than cores or piezometers. They would look like the PEDs that will be used pre-cap, but longer to assess pore water 1 foot down and at sediment surface also. <i>Battelle has 20 scoped in current proposal (final "bite of apple" in current contract)</i>	<i>outline of FSP by next week? #1- #5 only? Maybe 6 as well?</i> - Steve: include how long each task could take - development of field sampling plan
5 Physical characterization of the ambient sediment	John L. reported that the table circulated in February was a broad list that covered potential activities (including dredging). He will suggest specific parameters (geotechnical) that will aid in the design of the cap. It is uncertain if data should be collected now or wait until the initial design of the cap is completed.	- Beth A. will distribute a list of potential parameters - development of field sampling plan
6 Gas ebullition	discussion of path forward <i>~2 locations for gas trapping</i>	- develop field sampling plan and schedule <i>V/T is output</i>
7 Wave and current energy	- John L. has reviewed this effort with Ellen I. and spoke with Early Hayter (ERDC) on the existing modeling - contracting for this work (through Battelle) is nearly complete	- John L. will continue with updates
8 Ice impacts	- completed study by Andrew Tuthill concludes limited potential for cap impacts from ice	- Steve W. will provide a short summary of takeaway points relative to cap design
9 Construction complexity/impacts	- not yet initiated, this effort should develop a set of design criteria/goals - Dave D. emphasized being conservative as well as fast tracking this effort.	- field change notification being developed
10 Ecological functionality of completed cap and impact on surrounding area	- discussed the need to define habitat goals for the cap, e.g. does the final capped surface need to match existing elevations and slopes? Dave D. did not necessarily want to raise the near-shore elevation.	- Steve W. to schedule call with Barbara Bergen
11 Presumptive cap design starting point - Silver Lake (Pittsfield MA)		

probably not chem. analysis

delete

need to start focus on design & constructability; emphasis on SL as pre-sumptive design (as conservative & fast-tracking). Mech. or Hyd. ~~trucking~~ placement? Then lifts?!